

Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed November 25, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 25, 2008, Claims 1-6, 49, 53, 54, 56-60, 62, and 67-99 were pending. In the Office Action, Claims 75-82 and 92-99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 3-4, 49, 53-54, 57-58, 62, 67, 69-70, 75, 77-78, 84-85, 87-88, 92-93, and 95-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,876, hereafter Hotti) in view of Golshani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,066, hereafter Golshani). Claims 2-3, 5-6, 29-30, 56-57, 59-60, 68-69, 71-72, 76, 77, 79-80, 86-87, 89-90, 94-95, and 97-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti, in view of Golshani, and further in view of Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677, hereafter Wotring).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 53, 67, 75-82, 84, and 92-99, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6, 49, 53-54, 56-60, 62, and 67-99. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed November 25, 2008, Claims 75-82 and 92-99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 75-82 and 92-99 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed November 25, 2008, Claims 1, 3-4, 49, 53-54, 57-58, 62, 67, 69-70, 75, 77-78, 84-85, 87-88, 92-93, and 95-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,876) in view of Golshani (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,066). Claims 2-3, 5-6, 29-30, 56-57, 59-60, 68-69, 71-72, 75, 77, 79-80, 86-87, 89-90, 94-95, and 97-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti, in view of Golshani, and further in view of Wotring (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A method of managing a virtual content repository (VCR) that represents a plurality of content repositories, the method comprising:
creating at least one content node for each of the plurality of content repositories and associating each content node with its own schema, wherein each of the plurality of content repositories includes content that is unique from content in the other content repositories;
creating a plurality of hierarchy nodes, wherein each hierarchy node is a container for one or more of the content nodes, and wherein each hierarchy node is also associated with its own schema;
organizing the content and hierarchy nodes into a hierarchy in the VCR, and for each hierarchy node
associating the hierarchy node with an identifier that specifies its path location within the VCR,
associating the hierarchy node with at least one parent content node and one or more child content nodes, and
applying the hierarchy node's schema to each of the child content nodes;
storing the hierarchy and content nodes in the VCR; and
presenting the plurality of content repositories associated with the VCR as a single content repository to an application program interface, wherein each of the schemas-remain associated with their respective nodes.*

Claim 1, as amended, defines creating a plurality of hierarchy nodes, wherein each hierarchy node is a container for one or more of the content nodes, and wherein each hierarchy node is also associated with its own schema; organizing the content and hierarchy nodes into a hierarchy in the VCR, and for each hierarchy node associating the hierarchy node with an identifier that specifies its path location within the VCR, associating the hierarchy node with at least one parent content node and one or more child content nodes, and applying the hierarchy node's schema to each of the child content nodes.

Hotti discloses a management of distributed databases, and a method and an arrangement associated with managing database schemas and configuration of software that uses those schemas. (Abstract). Hotti also discloses a hierarchic system where several database systems a, b, c have their respective schema management nodes, 931a, 931b and

931c which manage the schemas of the respective database nodes. (Column 9, lines 18-21). The database systems have a common configuration management node 931 for managing schemas and application configuration of all database systems a, b and c. The configuration management nodes 931a, 931b and 931c of the individual database systems are thus replicas of the main configuration node 931. (Column 9, lines 18-27; Fig. 9)

Golshani discloses a method for integrating the schemas of a plurality of independent and heterogeneous database management systems of a distributed database management system. (Abstract). The [invention] is a software tool, or method, that generates and preserves an integrated global schema, which enables the user to present queries against a single global schema (that represents in a coherent manner all the desired data objects in all of the participating databases and all the relationships among the data objects) without any concern about where the data may come from or its physical environment. (Column 2, lines 20-27).

As described above, Hotti appears to disclose a hierarchical management system where each database system is associated with one management node, while Golshani appears to disclose a system for integrating database schemas from different databases. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define associating the hierarchy node with at least one parent content node and one or more child content nodes. Hotti in view of Golshani appears to show a management system that can include one management node for each database system. However, in Claim 1, a hierarchy node is associated with at least one parent content node and one or more child content nodes. Applicant respectfully submits that Hotti, in view of Golshani, does not disclose or render obvious the embodiment of Claim 1, as amended.

Furthermore, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define applying the hierarchy node's schema to each of the child content nodes. Thus, in Claim 1, each child content node can have at least two schema's applied to it: its own schema, and the hierarchy node's schema. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Hotti nor Golshani, alone or in combination, disclose or render obvious this feature.

Claim 1 has also been amended to more clearly define associating the hierarchy node with an identifier that specifies its path location within the VCR. Golshani does not appear to disclose any identifier and Hotti merely appears to disclose that TCP/IP compliant network may be used. Applicant respectfully submits that Hotti, in view of Golshani, does not appear to disclose or render obvious an identifier that specifies its path location within the VCR.

Application No.: 10/618,495
Office Action mailed: November 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action dated: April 27, 2009

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 53, 67, 75, 84, and 92

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 53, 67, 75, 84, and 92 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 53, 67, 75, 84, and 92, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 49, 54, 56-60, 62, 68-74, 76-82, 85-91, and 93-99

Claims 2-6, 49, 54, 56-60, 62, 68-74, 76-82, 85-91, and 93-99 have not been addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6, 49, 54, 56-60, 62, 68-74, 76-82, 85-91, and 93-99, are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/618,495
Office Action mailed: November 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action dated: April 27, 2009

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

A Petition for Extension of Time is enclosed herewith. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 27, 2009

By: _____
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910